



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,268	04/08/2004	William Redvers Belisle		7543

7590  
William Redvers Belisle  
7901 Lafourche St.  
New Orleans, LA 70127

06/04/2009

EXAMINER

LEE, MICHAEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/04/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/820,268

**Applicant(s)**

BELISLE, WILLIAM REDVERS

**Examiner**

M. Lee

**Art Unit**

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 4-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevens (6,018,339) in view of Graczyk et al. (5,192,999).

Regarding claim 1, Stevens discloses an automatic visual correction system for a computer screen showing a video signal being modified based on a user's prescription (col. 4, lines 20-37). The modified video signal enables a non-perfect vision user to see the displayed image on the screen. However, Stevens does not disclose that the modified video signal is a television signal which is transmitted from a television station. Using a personal computer to receive television signals transmitted from a television station is well known in the art. For instance, Graczyk teaches a television circuit in a multimedia computer for receiving television signals from television stations. By using the television circuit in the multimedia computer, a user can conveniently watch television programs on the computer monitor without using a separate television receiver. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Stevens so that the workstation computer could be used to watch television programs.

Regarding claim 2, the prescription for each user is fixed.

Regarding claim 4, the correction system of Stevens is not directly attached to a television.

3. Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevens (6,018,339) in view of Naiff (5,982,363).

Regarding claims 5, 6, 8 and 9, similar to rejections above, Stevens discloses an automatic visual correction system for a computer screen showing a video signal being modified based on a user's prescription (col. 4, lines 20-37). The modified video signal enables a non-perfect vision user to see the displayed image on the screen. However, Stevens does not disclose that the delivering device is located at the television station end as claimed. In any event, using a personal computer to transmit television signal to a remote television receiver is well known in the art such as taught by Naiff. In Naiff, a personal computer 20 is being used to transmit image data in conventional television format to a remote television receiver 22. Such setup enables a user to conveniently view the computer monitor image on the remote television receiver without using additional a computer monitor. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to adapt the computer image transmission scheme of Naiff into Stevens so that the computer generated image could be displayed on a remote television receiver.

Regarding claim 7, the automatic visual correction system can be attached to the television receiver instead of on the personal computer. The location of the device would have considered an obvious design choice because it can be arbitrarily placed.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 3/17/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In considering applicant arguments that Stevens does not disclose that the image enhancing operation is performed at the television receiver or at the television station, each of Graczyk and Naiff teaches the respective deficiency as stated above.

***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Lee whose telephone number 571-272-7349. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran, can be reached on 571-272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/M. Lee/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2622